REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,621,904 ("Elliott") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,143 ("Southgate"); and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,771,042 ("Santos-Gomez"). The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott in view of Southgate, in view of Santos-Gomez and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,731 ("Liles").

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed, in part. However, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 10 have been amended in response to the Examiner's remarks. It is respectfully submitted that such amendments are supported by the specification, claims, abstract of the disclosure and the drawings as originally filed, and that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott in view of Southgate and further in view of Santos-Gomez.

As per claims 1, 5 and 6, the Examiner asserted that Elliott discloses a system and method of an image display a main window for displaying main information and a sub window for displaying accompanying information associated with main information, and automatically arrangement changing the display position move to main window within a preset predetermined value, and arranging of sub window to a position adjacent to main window (col.2 , line 40 to col.3, line 30; FIG.2), although Elliott's description of related art discloses user able manually move the sub-window to user specified

position (col. 1) but Elliott's system is automatically arrangement in accordance with preset value (abstract) which does not require user-specified position. However, Southgate discloses a user interface control allows the user to move from one area to area (abstract, claim 2). The Examiner maintained that in regarding to conditional "if" sub window is moved to user specified position Santos discloses a snap region (Fig.4-5). The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to modify Elliott's system using Southgate's user interface control for moving a display position of sub window upon user-specified position, and Santos's "snap" feature because this give user composition of screen layout and furthermore displaying windows this way are utilizing display spaces effective and efficiently for user viewing without obscured information as suggested by Elliott/Southgate's (col.1-2).

As per claim 2, 7 and 10: recite from claim 1, the Examiner said that Elliott discloses a system for display a sub window adjacent to main window within a preset predetermined value, but Elliott's system discloses automatic arrangement the horizontal line in reserve order which is lower side instead upper side alignment of both windows (lower side of subwindow with lower side of mainwindow see FIG.2). The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention for change sub window coordinate to alignment the upper sides instead lower side of main window and sub window, because organizing the display window this way in some cases may maximize the display area.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott in view of Southgate and in view of Santos-Gomez and further in view of Liles.

As per claim 3, 8, 11: Recite from claim 1, but the Examiner admitted that Elliott's image display system does not discloses the main window displays a 3D Virtual Reality and sub windows display a chat perform via an avatar. However, the Examiner stated that Liles teaches present invention system relates to a virtual space which allows avatar freely move to desired position in a shared in 3D virtual space (abstract, col.3-4, Fig. 13). The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to combine Elliott's position windows display and Liles's disclosures for obtaining an image display which main window in 3D virtual reality space and sub window of a movable chat avatar, because this would enhance system performance and usability.

As per claim 4,9,12: Recite from claim 3, the Examiner said that Liles's system describes in virtual world 3D graphic data network communication with the server (col. 5-6) but the Examiner admitted that Liles does not disclose any particular language. Nonetheless, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to combine to select a well known VRML language for implement VR 3D graphics because this would enhance system performance.

Responsive Amendments and Argument

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed, in part.

Liles Has No Teaching Regarding Window Arrangement by a User

Liles teaches the display of avatars and chat among users. However, Liles, as understood, does not even teach, suggest or indicate that the chat window (or any window) *could* be moved, much less an enhanced way of positioning the window as claimed in the present application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Liles, whether alone or in combination with Elliott, Southgate and Santos-Gomez, does not teach, suggest or indicate the presently-claimed invention.

Elliott Does Not Teach, Suggest or Indicate the Presently-Claimed Invention

The Examiner's characterization of Elliott is respectfully traversed. Elliott, as understood, teaches a method for displaying a *new* window on a screen. (See Elliott at col. 2, lines 14-21.) Assuming that parent window 202 is already displayed on the screen, Elliott teaches whether and where new window 203 may be displayed on the screen without obscuring parent window 202. (*See, e.g.,* Elliott at FIG. 3 and col. 3, line 31 to col. 4, line 42.)

The present invention addresses a quite different situation. In the present application, a main window and a sub window are already displayed on a screen. (*See, e.g.,* FIG. 27 and claim 1.) A user then moves the sub window, for example by using a "drag and drop" operation with a mouse. (*See* specification at page 82, line 23 to p. 83, line 4; FIG. 28, step S51 {the "drop" function is typically referred to as a "clear"}.) Accordingly, independent claims

1, 5 and 6 (all of the independent claims in this application) were previously amended to recite the sub window being moved "from a first position, at which said sub window is initially displayed, to a user-specified position." These amendments clearly distinguish the presently-claimed invention from any teaching, suggestion or indication of Elliott, as understood.

Southgate Does Not Teach, Suggest or Indicate the Presently-Claimed Invention, Whether Alone or in Combination With Elliott

Southgate, as understood, teaches the division of a screen into a "tiled" area, with no overlap of windows, and a "cascading" or "overlapped" area, where windows may overlap. (See Abstract; independent claims 1, 11 and 12; FIG. 7; specification at col. 6, line 44 to col. 7, line 9.)

As understood, the only teaching in Southgate regarding a user's repositioning of a window is with regard to moving a window (the "selected window") from the overlapped area to the tiled area. (See col. 8, line 27 to col. 11, line 48 and FIG. 10.) In this aspect of the Southgate invention, it is first determined whether a tiled area exists and whether there is enough space in the tiled area for the selected window. (FIG. 10, steps 224 and 228; specification at col. 9, lines 25-34 and col. 10, lines 18-23.) Then, various subroutines are run to fit the selected window into the tiled area, including:

(1) a subroutine for incrementally extending the tiled area (FIG. 10, step 244); and (2) a subroutine for shrinking the selected window to fit inside the space available in the tiled area. (FIG. 10, step 242.)

In some situations, the selected window still cannot fit into the tiled area and the user is duly notified. (FIG. 10, step 254.)

In contrast, the presently-claimed invention starts with a main window and a sub window already displayed, with room for both

windows on the screen. (See FIGS. 29-32 and claims 1, 5 and 6 {e.g., "a first position, at which said sub window is initially displayed"}.) Although the present invention *could* include re-sizing windows, neither changing the size of the sub window nor creating more space for the sub window would typically be necessary to practice the invention. Moreover, the presently-claimed invention could be used in a tiled area or an overlapped area, although it would normally be preferable to use the invention in a "tiled" environment.

Santos-Gomez Does Not Teach, Suggest or Indicate the Presently-Claimed Invention, Whether Alone or in Combination With Elliott and Southgate

Santos-Gomez, as understood, teaches various methods of repositioning existing windows, which are referred to as "workspaces" in the Santos-Gomez patent. (*See, e.g.,* FIG. 2.) Each "workspace" has a "resizable" border. (*See, e.g.,* reference numerals 33 and 35 of Fig. 2.) Santos-Gomez teaches a method of "snapping" together these resizable borders when the borders are moved close together:

> Thus, workspaces may be connected by snapping the border of a workspace to the border of an adjacent workspace to create a single size control separator for the borders of adjacent workspaces when the border of a workspace is moved to within a predetermined distance from the border of an adjacent workspace.

(Col. 5, lines 53-59.)

However, Santos-Gomez teaches that this "snapping" is accomplished by "resizing" the height or width of a workspace:

> While the above connection of workspaces has been described with respect to resizing the height or vertical dimension of the workspaces, as will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, the same connection of workspaces and

resizing may be readily accomplished in the width or horizontal dimension.

(Col. 5, lines 61-66.)

As understood, Santos-Gomez does not describe any method for "snapping" workspaces together without resizing them. This is understandable, because the main thrust of Santos-Gomez's invention, as understood, is resizing and repositioning all windows to produce common borders (such as common borders 56 and 57 of FIG. 5), in order to enable a "single size control separator" (*see* reference numeral 55 of FIG. 5) for simultaneously controlling all contiguous workspaces. (*See, e.g.,* col. 6, line 32 through col. 7, line 8.)

Therefore, in order to further distinguish the presently-claimed invention from the teachings of Elliott, Southgate and Santos-Gomez, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> an automatic arrangement changing means for automatically [changing an arrangement of] moving said sub window to a position adjacent to said main window without altering a height or a width of said sub window if, after said sub window is moved to said user-specified position, a separated distance between said sub window and said main window is within a preset predetermined value.

Parallel amendments have been made to independent claims 5 and 6. It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments patentably distinguish claims 1, 5 and 6 from Santos-Gomez, Elliott, Liles and Southgate, whether alone or in combination. Dependent claims 2-4, 7-9 and 10-12 are patentable because they depend from patentable claims 1, 5 and 6, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and argument, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LIMBACH & LIMBACH L.L.P.

Dated: November 7, 2000   By: Roger S. Sampson

Roger S. Sampson
Reg. No. 44,314

Attorneys for Applicants